

## **REMARKS**

Applicants' Amendment and Response mailed on November 12, 2003, has been received and entered. The Amendment and Response, however, was stated as not being fully responsive to the prior Office Action due to a confusion as to the status of Claims 8, 9 and 17. This Amendment and Response replaces the Amendment and Response which was mailed on November 12, 2003. Claims 8, 9 and 17 should be pending and not cancelled. Accordingly, in this response, Claims 8, 9 and 17 are shown as being pending and not cancelled. It is believed that this Amendment and Response is fully responsive to both the prior Office Action and the Office Communication and that the status of the claims is now clear.

Claims 1-20, and 22-24 are now pending in the application. Claim 13 stands withdrawn. Claim 21 has been cancelled herein. Claims 22-24 have been added herein. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 4 can be found at least on Page 28, lines 8-21 and Figure 2. Support for the amendments to Claims 8 and 9 can be found at least on Page 73, lines 16-20 and in Figure 20. Support for the amendment to Claim 10 can be found at least in Figure 15. Support for the amendment to Claim 12 can be found at least in Figure 21. Support for the amendments to Claims 14 and 20 can be found at least on Page 75, line 7 – Page 76, line 8, Page 76, line 18 – Page 77, line 5 and Figures 25 and 26. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Attached is a "Replacement Sheet" showing Figures 31a-b for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet" Figures 31a-b have been designated as "Prior Art". It is believed that the change to Figures 31a-b render the objection moot and, accordingly, withdrawal of the instant objection is requested.

Also attached is a "Replacement Sheet" of drawings which includes changes to Figure 20 to correct the reference indicia of the components of the insulation layer 110 from "110(111.112)" to "110(112.113)."

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-6 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Toshimitsu et al. (Japanese Pat. No. 63-092926). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Referring to Claim 1, a liquid crystal device is recited and calls for "a part of an area that is free of the wiring lines in the protruding area of the one substrate are coated with a second insulation film made of the same material as the first insulation film." Similarly, Claim 4 recites a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal device and calls for "forming an insulation film covering at least . . . a part of an area that is free of the wiring lines in the protruding area of the one substrate." In contrast, the Toshimitsu et al. reference does not disclose a part of an area that is free of the wiring lines in the protruding area of the one substrate being coated/covered with an insulation film. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of Claims 1 and 4 are

not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Toshimitsu et al. reference. Claims 2-3 both depend from Claim 1 and, therefore, for at least the reason stated above with reference to Claim 1 are also not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Toshimitsu et al. reference. Claims 5-7 all depend from Claim 4 and, therefore, for at least the reasons stated above with reference to Claim 4 are also not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Toshimitsu et al. reference. Accordingly, removal of the instant rejections is requested.

Claim 8 is directed to a liquid crystal device and calls for “wherein at least a part of the wiring lines and at least one of the corners of the protruding area are coated with a protective film including the overcoat layer and the orientation film.” Similarly, Claim 9 recites a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal device and calls for “forming an overcoat layer on the electrodes, the wiring lines, and at least one of the corners of the protruding area.” In contrast, the Toshimitsu reference does not disclose at least one of the corners of the protruding area having an overcoat layer thereon. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of Claims 8 and 9 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Toshimitsu et al. reference.

Referring now to Claim 10, the claim recites a liquid crystal device and calls for “wherein the protruding area includes wiring lines electrically connected to the electrodes provided on the other substrate via a conductive connection member in the seal, at least a part of the wiring lines being coated with the insulation layer, and wherein the wiring lines immediately beneath the conductive connection member are free of the insulation layer.” In contrast, the Toshimitsu et al. reference does not disclose a conductive connection member in the seal as called for in Claim 10.

Additionally, the Toshimitsu et al. reference does not disclose the wiring lines immediately beneath the conductive connection member, which is in the seal, being free from the insulation layer as called for in Claim 10. Rather, the insulating film 3 covers transparent electrode/wirings 2 as the wirings extend beneath seal 5. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Toshimitsu et al. reference does not disclose, teach nor suggest the limitations called for in Claim 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of Claim 10 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Toshimitsu et al. reference. Claim 11 depends from Claim 10 and, therefore, for at least the reason stated above with reference to Claim 10 is also not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Toshimitsu et al. reference. Accordingly, removal of the instant rejections is requested.

Referring now to claim 12, a liquid crystal device is recited and calls for "a mold member is disposed on the wiring lines formed between the packaging area and the seal member, the entirety of the mold member being disposed between the seal member and the IC." In contrast, the Toshimitsu et al. reference discloses a mold member 11 that is positioned on both sides of the IC (semi-conductor chip 9). Thus, an entirety of the mold member 11 is not disposed between the seal 5 and the IC as called for in Claim 12. Accordingly, for at least this reason it is respectfully submitted that Claim 12 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Toshimitsu et al. reference and removal of the instant rejection is requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 7-9 and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshimitsu et al. (Japanese Pat. No. 63-092926) in view of Baeger (U.S. Pat. No. 4,483,591). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 4. As stated above, the Toshimitsu et al. reference fails to anticipate the subject matter of Claim 4. It is respectfully submitted that the Baeger reference does not disclose the subject matter lacking in the Toshimitsu et al. reference to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of Claim 4. Thus, for at least this reason it is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over the prior art of record. Similarly, the Toshimitsu et al. reference fails to anticipate the subject matter of Claims 8 and 9. It is respectfully submitted that the teachings of the Baeger reference do not overcome the shortcomings in the Toshimitsu et al. reference to anticipate or render obvious Claims 8 and 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 8 and 9 are patentable over the prior art of record. Thus, removal of the instant rejections is requested.

Referring to Claim 14, the claim calls for “wherein the protruding area includes a positioning mark, the positioning mark defines both positions of the edge of the insulation film and an edge of the orientation film.” Similarly, Claim 20 calls for “forming a positioning mark on the one substrate, wherein the insulation film is formed along one outer edge of the positioning mark, the orientation film is formed along another outer edge of the positioning mark.” It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not disclosed, taught nor suggested in the prior art of record.

In the Office Action, the conductive bridge 10 of the Baeger reference is cited as being equivalent to the positioning mark. It is respectfully submitted that the conductive bridge 10 of the Baeger reference is completely unrelated to the positioning mark called for in Claims 14 and 20. Specifically, the Baeger reference teaches that an electrical connection can be made to a conductive layer beneath an insulating layer without requiring the removal of the insulating layer. To accomplish this, the Baeger reference teaches and discloses the forming of a conductive bridge 10 by placing a conductive material on the porous insulating layer 5', which has been subjected to a brief drying process, and allowing the conductive bridge material to diffuse into the pores of the insulating layer 5'. The substrate is then subjected to a firing process, with the result that the insulating layer 5 is hardened except for the regions having the conductive material (conductive bridge 10) and that the connecting wire 8 can now be soldered to the conductive substance 10. See at least column 2, lines 14-29 and column 4, lines 36-53 of the Baeger reference.

Thus, the Baeger reference discloses applying specific substances to a porous insulating layer that diffuses through the pores and allows a wire to be electrically conductively connected to the conductive layer beneath the insulating layer via the conductive bridge. This disclosing and teaching of a conductive bridge 10 is completely unrelated to a positioning mark formed on one of the substrates and then using those positioning mark to determine the extent to which an insulation film and an orientation film are formed as called for in Claims 14 and 20. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of Claims 14 and 20 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art of record. Claims 15-19 all depend from Claim 14 and,

therefore, for at least the reason stated above with reference to Claim 14 are also not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art of record. Thus, removal of the instant rejections is requested.

Claim 21 has been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 21 is rendered moot. Thus, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants' representative therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 25, 2004

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,982  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 46,232

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/ps